



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,797	09/12/2006	Cornelis Versluijs	NL 040252	1505

24737 7590 07/10/2008  
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
----------

PATEL, ASHOK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2889

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/10/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/598,797	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VERSLUIJS, CORNELIS	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ashok Patel	<b>Art Unit</b> 2889	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

Art Unit: 2889

1. Applicant is advised that the USPTO has not received any IDS as of the date of this office action.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Notelteirs et al (USPN 3736455).

As to claims 1 and 6, Notelteirs et al disclose applicant's claimed filament halogen lamp comprising a sealed transparent vessel (1) containing at least two coiled filaments (3, 8) and conductive means (4, 5) for supplying electric power to each of the at least two coils, characterized in that two coils are positioned coaxially, and in that the two coils has different diameters, and in that at least a portion of the coil having the larger diameter surrounds at least a portion of the coil having the smaller diameter.

As to claim 4, Notelteirs et al disclose the coil having the smaller diameter is longer than the coil having the larger diameter.

Art Unit: 2889

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 2, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notelteirs et al, as applied to claim 1.

As to claim 2, Notelteirs et al disclose the two coils substantially coaxial with respect to the tube-like vessel, as claimed by applicant. Notelteirs et al however do not disclose the means for supplying electric power to the coils including feedthrough poles at one end of the tube-like vessel. Instead, Notelteirs et al disclose the means for supplying electric power to the coils including only one feedthrough pole at one end of the tube-like vessel. However, such difference is due to the

Art Unit: 2889

fact that each end of Notelteirs et al's vessel includes one feedthrough pole through it, whereas only one end of applicant's claimed vessel includes both feedthrough poles through it.

Therefore, depending upon typical configuration of a filament and vessel, applicant's claimed feedthrough poles at one end of the vessel would have been a matter of obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As to claim 3, Notelteirs et al do not disclose the filament forming the larger diameter coil has a larger thickness than the filament forming smaller diameter coil, as claimed by applicant. However such design would have been a matter of obvious design alternative to one of ordinary skill in the art since the claimed configuration is not stated to solve any particular problem that is not solved by a conventional prior art lamp filament design.

As to claim 5, Notelteirs et al do not disclose the larger diameter coil surrounding one end of the smaller diameter coil over a length equal to the length of the larger diameter coil, as claimed by applicant.

Notelteirs et al instead disclose the larger diameter coil disposed somewhere at an intermediate location of the length of the smaller diameter coil. Such a difference would have been however a matter of obvious design choice to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2889

skill in the art for providing the two coils within the vessel. It should be noted that applicant's claimed typical configuration of the two coils is not stated to solve any particular problem that is not solved by a conventional prior art lamp filament coils configuration.

6. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notelteirs et al in view of Bergman et al (USPN 4942331).

As to claims 7 and 8, Notelteirs et al do not disclose a lamp assembly including above-mentioned filament lamp and reflector. However, Bergman et al is cited for showing a teaching that the filament assembly (Figure 5) includes a filament lamp and a reflector.

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Notelteirs et al suitably within Bergman et al's lamp assembly for use a reflector lamp.

As to claim 2, characterized in that the vessel has a tube-like shape, whereby the means for supplying electric power to the coils includes feed through poles at one end of the tube-like vessel, and whereby the two coils are substantial coaxial with respect to the tube-like vessel.

Art Unit: 2889

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-2456. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minh-Toan Ton can be reached on 571-272-2303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Ashok Patel/  
**Ashok Patel**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 2879**